

App. No. 09/503,215
Amendment dated July 30, 2004
Reply to final Office action of June 15, 2004

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-26, 28-33, 36 and 41-47 are pending in the application. The Office Action mailed on June 15, 2004 rejected Claims 1-26, 28-33, 36 and 41-47 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a). Claims 1, 14, 15, 21, 23, 24, 28-32, 36, 41, and 46 have been amended. No new matter has been added to the application. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejection in view of the following remarks.

Claims 1-20, 28-33, 36, and 41-47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Fortin* (U.S. Patent No. 5,528,753) in view of *Kaufer* (U.S. Patent No. 5,812,828). Claims 21-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Fortin* in view of *Kaufer*, and further in view of *Peek* (U.S. Patent No. 5,481,706). Applicants respectfully disagree.

The Office Action rejected independent Claim 1 by citing a procedure described in *Fortin* for monitoring a routine. Claim 1, as amended, teaches "retrieving the access information from the function lookup table using the name of the original function; and invoking the original function using the access information." The method taught by Claim 1 is significantly different from the procedure in *Fortin* cited by the Office Action.

The procedure in *Fortin* is directed to the sequential execution of a target routine, an entry routine, and an exit routine when the target routine is called such that the entry and exit routines collect information about the target routine. Neither *Fortin*, *Kaufer*, *Peek* nor any combination thereof disclose anything about "retrieving the access information from the function lookup table using the name of the original function; and invoking the original function using the access information," as recited in Applicants' amended Claim 1. Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of Claim 1 is overcome and request that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 15, 21, 23, 28-31, 36 and 41, as amended, include limitations substantially similar (albeit different in other important ways) to the limitations claimed in the currently amended Claim 1. As discussed above, Claim 1 is allowable. Thus, Claims 15, 21, 23, 28-31, 36 and 41 are allowable for at least the same reasons that Claim 1 is allowable, and notice to that effect is solicited. Furthermore, dependent Claims 2-14, 16-20, 22, 24-26, 32, 33 and 42-47 are allowable


App. No. 09/503,215
Amendment dated July 30, 2004
Reply to final Office action of June 15, 2004

for at least the same reasons that the base claims on which they rely are allowable, and notice to that effect is solicited.

In view of the foregoing remarks, all pending claims are believed to be allowable and the application is in condition for allowance. Therefore, a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested. Should the Examiner have any further issues regarding this application, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney for the applicant at the telephone number provided below.

Respectfully submitted,

MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.



Timothy P. Sullivan

Registration No. 47,981

Direct Dial: 206.342.6254

MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.
P. O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-0903
206.342.6200
JJF/ab

27488

PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE